1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Subscription Defendants¹ and Defendant Blair McNea (collectively the "Defendants"), through their undersigned counsel, hereby file this Unopposed Motion for Leave to File First Amended Answer to Complaint. As grounds therefore, the Defendants state as follows:

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERRAL

Pursuant to Nevada Local Rules of Civil Procedure LR IA 1-3(f), Defendants have met and conferred with the FTC in good faith regarding this Motion for Leave, and the FTC has indicated it does not oppose the relief requested herein to file a motion for leave to file an amended answer. The FTC has indicated that it reserves the right to challenge the contents and legal basis of the Defendants' amendments to the answer at later proceedings.

INTRODUCTION

Defendants filed their answer to the FTC's complaint on September 9, 2017. Pursuant to the Court's Scheduling order, the deadline to amend or add parties is December 7, 2017. In response to this deadline, Defendants have filed this motion seeking leave of court to file its first amended answer to complaint as attached hereto. The amendments to the Defendants' Answer include the addition of three affirmative defenses noted as Defenses 11-13 in the Amended Answer. The Ninth Circuit applies Rule 15's policy of favoring amendments with extreme liberality. This motion was timely filed within the Court's deadline to amend pleadings. Therefore, the Defendants' respectfully request that the Court grant its Motion for Leave to file First Amended Answer.

ARGUMENT

"A party may amend its pleading once as a matter of course within: (A) 21 days after serving it, or (B) if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier." Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a). Otherwise, a party must seek leave of court to amend a pleading. Fed.R.Civ.P. 15(a)(2).

¹ The Subscription Defendants include all of the Defendants except for: RoadRunner B2C, LLC, also d/b/a RevGO, LLC; RevGuard, LLC; RevLive!, LLC; Danielle Foss; and Jennifer Johnson.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The determination of whether to grant leave to amend lies "within the sound discretion of the trial court," DCD Programs, Ltd. v. United States, 833 F.2d 183, 185 (9th Cir.1987) (citing United States v. Webb, 655 F.2d 977, 979 (9th Cir.1981)), but such discretion should be guided by the underlying purpose of Rule 15-facilitation of a decision on the merits. See DCD Programs, Ltd. v. Leighton, 883 F.2d 183, 186 (9th Cir.1987) (citation omitted). Rule 15's policy of favoring amendments is applied in the Ninth Circuit with "extreme liberality." Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc., 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir.2001) (quoting Morongo Band of Mission Indians v. Rose, 893 F.2d 1074, 1079 (9th Cir.1990)). While the court should freely give leave to amend when justice requires, leave need not be granted where amendment: "(1) prejudices the opposing party; (2) is sought in bad faith; (3) produces an undue delay in litigation; or (4) is futile." Amerisource Bergen Corp. v. Dialysist West, Inc., 465 F.3d 946, 951 (9th Cir.2006) (citation omitted). Absent prejudice, or a strong showing of any of the remaining factors, a presumption exists under Rule 15 in favor of granting leave to amend. Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003).

Granting leave to file an amended answer with additional affirmative defenses will not cause prejudice or produce an undue delay in litigation. As noted above, the Court's scheduling order has set December 7, 2017 as the deadline for amending pleadings or adding parties. This timely motion will not cause prejudice because discovery as not yet taken place and an amended answer does not require a responsive pleading from the FTC. Furthermore, the amendments are not sought in bad faith as the additional defenses are rooted in Supreme Court law. Finally, granting leave to amend will not cause and undue delay in litigation because the motion is timely filed within the Court's deadline to amend pleadings.

The Ninth Circuit applies Rule 15's policy of favoring amendments with "extreme liberality." Owens v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc., 244 F.3d 708, 712 (9th Cir. 2001). As noted above, the Court's scheduling order has set today, December 7, 2017 as the deadline for amending pleadings or adding parties. Therefore, the Defendants request that the Court grant its unopposed Motion for Leave to File its First Amended Answer to Complaint. Pursuant to

	1	District of Nevada Local Rules of Civil Procedure 15-1, the First Amended Answer is attached to	
	2	this motion as Exhibit A.	
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 400 North Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Telephone. (702) 792-3773 Facsimile. (702) 792-9002	3	WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, the Defendants respectfully request that the	
	4	Court grant the Unopposed Motion for Leave to File First Amended Answer to Complaint	
	5	attached hereto, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15.	
	6		
	7		s <u>/Giovanni M. Ruscitti</u> GIOVANNI M. RUSCITTI
	8	GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
	9		BERG HILL GREENLEAF RUSCITTI LLP
		Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 1	712 Pearl Street
	10	11	Soulder, Colorado 80302 Felephone: 303-402.1600
	11	Email: <u>swanise@gtlaw.com</u> F	Facsimile: 303-402-1601
	12		Email: gmr@bhgrlaw.com
	13	CLAUDE C. WILD III	
	14	(<i>Admitted Pro Hac Vice</i>) 9247 Mornington Way	
		Lone Tree, CO 80124	
	15	Telephone: 303-916-9082	
	16	Email: cwild@claudewildlaw.com	
	17	Attorneys for Corporate	
	18	Defendants and Blair McNea	
	19		
	20		0
	21	IT IS SO ORDERED.	ANDREW P. GORDON
	22		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 12/11/2017
	23		12/11/2017
	24		
	25		
	26		
	27		